

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/309,766 05/11/99 FUJIMURA

H 35.G2387

005514 MMC1/1108
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK NY 10112

EXAMINER

RAMSEY, K

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2879

DATE MAILED: 11/08/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/309,766	Applicant(s) Fujimura et al
	Examiner Kenneth J. Ramsey	Group Art Unit 2879

Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

This action is **FINAL**.

Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.

Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is approved disapproved.

The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

All Some* None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.

received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____.

Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 3, 4, & 5

Interview Summary, PTO-413

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2879

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-4, 6-7, 13-16 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kawade et al, EP 732,721. According to Kawade et al, page 20, lines 9-12, the vessel 86 is simultaneously heated and exhausted until the exhaust pipe is sealed (chipped off). After sealing the exhaust tube, a getter is activated. This meets all of the claim limitations since the time of the getter activation is not specified.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8, 10-20 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawade et al in view of Kato et al. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to include both a non-evaporable getter and an evaporable getter in the vessel of Kawade et al since Kato et al teach that gaseous contaminants produced during the exhaustion and sealing process can harm the cathodes if not gettered by a non-evaporable prior to sealing the exhaust

Art Unit: 2879

tube. As to claims 5 and 6, the evacuation step is both prior to and during the activation of the non-evaporable getter since the temperature must be raised to activate the non-evaporable getter. As to claims 10-12 and 22-24, the evaporable getter is obviously degassed during the heating and evacuation of the tube as are the other tube components.

Claims 9 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawade et al and Kato et al as applied to claims 8 and 20 above, and further in view of Wallace et al. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to provide means for reactivating the non-evaporable getter such as taught by Wallace et al, column 6, line 66 through column 7, line 61, to thereby avoid the necessity of including a second evaporable getter.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Kenneth J. Ramsey, (703)308-2324 (voice), (703) 308-7382 (fax).

KJR
November 3, 2000

Kenneth J. Ramsey
KENNETH J. RAMSEY
PRIMARY EXAMINER